

The most complex fraud in history - some holiday reading

1. GLOBAL AMBITION, POLITICS AND DECEPTIVE GREEN-WASHING, THE GREAT UN IPCC GLOBAL WARMING FRAUD AND ITS NEW ZEALAND AGENCY
2. THE EARTH'S CLIMATE IS A TRULY WONDERFUL THING
3. CLIMATE EMERGENCY - IS IT AN ACCIDENTAL TRAIL OF MISTAKES, OR A FRAUD BY DESIGN
4. The Loss of Innocence for NZ Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern's Team of Five Million – Part I
5. The Loss of Innocence for Jacinda Ardern's Team of Five Million – Part II - The Most Probable Cause of Climate Change during the Holocene Interglacial Period
6. FORMAL COMPLAINT TO THE OFFICER COMMANDING, NZ POLICE – HENDERSON AREA

1. GLOBAL AMBITION, POLITICS AND DECEPTIVE GREEN-WASHING

THE GREAT UN IPCC GLOBAL WARMING FRAUD AND ITS NEW ZEALAND AGENCY

As Albert Einstein is reputed to have said:

“The world is in greater peril from those who tolerate or encourage evil than from those who actually commit it.”

Now think it through for yourself:

It is illogical to consider that three relatively ineffectual human-influenced greenhouse gases which in total are less than 4% of the volume of water vapour (the far more potent greenhouse gas) can drive climate change, **just because a group of bureaucrats at the United Nations say it is “settled science”**. If one private investigator, sees through this deception, then New Zealand scientists have not done rigorous due diligence. The Great Global Warming Fraud costs OECD countries (USD) hundreds of billions yearly without justification.

The most important things you need to know are:

- Methane and Nitrous Oxide have never had any proven impact on the earth's climate.
- Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide (“CO₂”) is a more prolific greenhouse gas but...
 - o There is no empirical scientific evidence that CO₂ has ever had a material effect on earth's climate. The UN and their supporters have never offered any. Nor will they.
 - o The proportion of CO₂ emissions that humans influence is less than 5% of the total.
 - o The main source of CO₂ emissions is “ocean out-gassing” after it begins to warm.

- CO₂ is subject to the Beer-Lambert Law of Physics and therefore any thermal impact was almost saturated at the pre-industrial atmospheric level of 280ppm in 1850.
- CO₂ is not a pollutant and “zero carbon” would halt Earth’s present greening.
- There was never any consensus to support this hoax... <http://www.petitionproject.org/>
- There is no climate crisis... <https://clintel.org/world-climate-declaration/>
- Plants thrive with three times current levels of atmospheric CO₂, (arguably in short supply).
- The “Milankovich cycles” drive the 100,000 year climate cycles of ice ages and interglacials.
- In between, climate change is dominated by the sun which supplies 99.9% of earth’s energy.
- The Sun’s influence is cyclical with 11 year and 170-200 year cycles of warming and cooling.
- The climate at any place on earth depends on its Latitude, Altitude and the typical humidity.
- Few of those who signed up to the Paris accords have either the intention or ability to comply. It is impossible for New Zealand, even with total support, to get any value from this.
- The majority of the earth’s population is led by people who refuse to bow to this fraud.

I warned the Government in 2018 of their likely complicity in a serious fraud. The Minister prevaricated, so I warned him in 2019 of the actionable basis for a complaint of malfeasance.

As a result of their intransigence, I submitted my allegations to the proper authorities for their investigation and action. Twelve months later there has been no action taken, but I am now able to demonstrate why changes in the level of atmospheric CO₂ have no material climate effect. So the only climate emergency for the New Zealand public to worry about is the cynical attempt by politicians to deceive us. While we have much to do to prevent pollution, climate change is natural.

John Rofe, Private Investigator
30.11.2020

Auckland, New Zealand,

2. THE EARTH’S CLIMATE IS A TRULY WONDERFUL THING

After 15 years of trying to figure out whether the “Warming Alarmists” or the “Climate Change Deniers” are right, I have concluded that the causes of climate change are almost totally natural...solar variability on the one hand (because the sun provides 99.9% of Earth’s energy) and the water cycle on the other (because 71% of the Earth’s surface is covered by water and its evaporation, condensation and precipitation can be seen to affect the climate everywhere, from place to place and from time to time). Just elegant natural homeostasis.

1.15 trillion tonnes of surface water is converted into water vapour every day and being lighter than air, it rises to the skies, cooling as it ascends (because the air cools by 6.5°C with every 1,000 metres of altitude). Then it forms clouds and they mask 60-70% of Earth’s surface. When

condensation has completed the cycle, and minute water vapour droplets coalesce into rain drops, hail or snow, precipitation of an approximate 1.15 trillion tonnes descends, leaving between 15-20 trillion tonnes in the atmosphere at any point in time.

So the sun heats the Earth and the water cycle moderates both the day-time heating and discharge of night-time heat into space. This is easily provable from official published meteorological data, yet no-one is interested in fact checking, because it would end the gravy train for so many over-paid pseudo-scientists.

Over geological time, the Earth's attitude to, and the distance from the sun has been the cause of the massive variability in the global temperatures between ice ages and intervening interglacial periods. These "long period" changes are referred to as Milankovich cycles, but they are of no immediate relevance.

For the "Alarmists" to blatantly ignore the 10,000 years history of the current interglacial period (known as the Holocene) and impute a dominant role for humanity's effects in the changed levels of certain trace gases is at best a gross exaggeration. There is no evidence that any change in atmospheric carbon dioxide has caused climate change although the reverse has been indicated as possible from Antarctic ice core analysis.

For our leaders to be conned by the protestations of parties benefitting from the deception that it is "settled science" (i.e. UN IPCC) is at best incompetent or at worst malfeasance. We rightly expected NIWA, the Ministry for the Environment and cabinet ministers have exercised rigorous oversight of public expenditure.

For our Minister for Climate Change to write a letter in response to my provision of evidence (in 2018) to inform me that good science is never settled, but in this case he is sure it is, defied all logic. There is no empirical scientific justification for his actions so this showed that no independent New Zealand due diligence was ever performed before the Zero Carbon legislation was enacted by our Parliament.

It is often argued that the motive for the deception has been the desire of people beyond our shores to tax an element of the periodic table that is the very essence of all life on Earth – carbon. That was why finding human involvement in climate change was central to the role of the *United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. With an open chequebook from many governments, the OECD's scientific community was set to work to employ "confirmation bias" and sophistry in order to achieve the required result.

Around the world and in most countries (from the outset) the bogus nature of this hoax has been resisted by scientists. They are in part the heroes of this sorry business even though blatant systemic media bias in favour of the hoax has left them impotent and ignored (even ridiculed) despite no evidence supporting the supposed orthodoxy. But every serious scientist works in a silo. In critic's silos their expertise is contested, but the overwhelming impossibility of the UN theory disappears into the mist of deliberate sophistry. In 30 years of deliberate malfeasance, science and the scientific method has been corrupted. Censorship follows.

How did climate science get corrupted when the corrupting process occurred in the plain sight?

1. The Vostok ice core experiments were alternately ignored or misinterpreted.
2. The historical impacts of solar variability were actively suppressed – whether they came from the 11- year regular solar cycles, or the longer term Grand Solar Maximums and Minimums.
3. The volume of human influenced “greenhouse gases” was overstated and their efficacy magnified.
4. The measurement by atomic absorption spectroscopy of the impacts of various gases was ignored and the impact of the Beer-Lambert law of physics which down-rated the efficacy of additional concentrations of atmospheric carbon dioxide and methane was also minimised by either intent or modelling emphasis.
5. The true natural power of the water cycle was de-rated by deliberately splitting up the three thermally active phases of (i) evaporation – yielding water vapour, (ii) condensation - yielding clouds, and (iii) precipitation-yielding rain hail or snow (by which high altitude H₂O is transferred to earth’s surface with cooling effect). It is the water cycle that always provides the climate with moderation.
6. The automatic cleansing effect of the water cycle is deliberately ignored and in particular the way in which rain brings carbon dioxide (which is also heavier than air) and all pollutants – including residue of the worst catastrophic events earth can sustain - back down to where we live, farm and fish.
7. The impact of the variable heating from sub-sea volcanism is little understood as is the impact of changes to the magnetosphere from changes in the variability of solar electromagnetic energy.
8. There is a large area of study still into the role and impact of the changed cyclic influx of galactic cosmic rays on cloud formation and the huge variability in the changes in the thickness and temperature of Earth’s Thermosphere.

With new missions now on their way to Mars, “Climate Science”, the one-dimensional perspective of Earth’s climate being enclosed in a greenhouse is akin to the now rejected flat earth theories of the 17th Century.

Climatologists now keep a weather eye on the “space weather” (key variables are published each day on www.spaceweather.com). There is growing evidence that it is the space weather (where the role of the sun dominates) that drives our terrestrial climate. Certainly, that has been the interpretation of the folk running the Russian experiments on the International Space Station. Their views are shared by many NASA astronauts. So what is delivered to us as “settled science” is really just a set of theories for which there is no empirical scientific proof at all! Human carbon emissions don’t have any significant role to play.

While we are told that many countries do not support the actions of the UN (such as with the Paris Accords), the fact is that there are good and proper reasons to object – and from objectors there is solid irrefutable empirical scientific evidence, in addition to the factors that were accepted by the Russian Academy of Sciences in this 2014 presentation: (please forgive and forget the audio: concentrate on the screen shots)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gdNw8-Cq8h8&feature=emb_logo

The use of “misdirection” techniques is too obvious to ignore and this suggests there is an undercurrent of intent to deceive in much of the material I have reviewed. So the proper authorities have been informed.

John Rofe Auckland, New Zealand

20 October 2020

3. CLIMATE EMERGENCY - IS IT AN ACCIDENTAL TRAIL OF MISTAKES, OR A FRAUD BY DESIGN

Accidents happen. But if we are to establish whether the mistakes made at the behest of those who dominate the agenda of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (“UN IPCC”) are either an extraordinary trail of mistakes or just a vexatious fraud, we need to take the following factors into consideration:

1. What due diligence occurred at either the UN level or the level of our Government and its agencies to verify the extravagant claim that human carbon emissions cause climate change, either directly or indirectly?
2. Have those promoting the mischievous agenda ever provided empirical scientific evidence to back up their theories? It is thirty plus years on and yet nothing to be seen. Why does the data not support the theory?
3. When notified of evidence of their mistakes, what actions were taken to correct them?
4. Are there clear pecuniary, reputational or political motivations for taking actions to profit from mistakes and for ignoring or rebutting the advice of independent experts?
5. Have those folk promoting Anthropogenic Global Warming Theory provided exaggerated, or deceptive and misleading advice to the NZ public regarding their theory and the evidence they hold to support it?
6. Has there been any “misdirection”, or unreasonable explanations for the mistakes that are being used in order to prolong a mistaken belief or deliberately false narrative?
7. Have there been efforts to silence the valid criticism of learned sceptics in universities, professional publications and in the mainstream news media?
8. Have sanctions been imposed on critics using strategies such as career termination, job dismissal, failure to promote, failure to provide peer review or provide access to publication... and the marginalisation of critics?
9. Have the freedom of speech rights of critics been withdrawn or abridged?

In the case of the bogus Climate Emergency, all of these ploys have been used to stifle both debate and the facts.

Atmospheric carbon dioxide (hereafter “CO₂”), along with water and light are the sole building blocks for all plant life on Earth. They form the basis of the global food pyramid for all species. Tasteless, colourless and odourless, carbon dioxide is now just a trace gas which makes up about 0.04% of the atmosphere. It has increased in concentration from 280ppm to 415ppm since 1850, and during that time, NASA studies (including satellite evidence) have shown

planet Earth has greened as a direct result of the increased level of atmospheric CO₂. Furthermore, studies have shown that plants become significantly more drought resistant and growth is enhanced up to 1,200ppm.

For human respiratory limitations, submariners have a maximum operational level of 5,000ppm and NASA and other space agencies prefer an ambient level of below 7,000ppm, to maintain operational effectiveness.

For this reason the argument that CO₂ is a pollutant (with belching smoke stacks shown on TV as emphasis) is deliberately misleading, because CO₂ is known to be invisible as is water vapour, methane and nitrous oxide. It is essential to all life on Earth. Those four gases are the subject of a deliberate UN IPCC- coordinated beat-up.

There is no good reason to either reduce the atmospheric level of CO₂ or to seek to reduce human emissions. The only valid focus should be on pollution-reduction efforts. What heightens the disgusting spectacle of prominent leaders (world and domestic) trying to frighten the general public with threats, is their blatant disregard for the most important of all the facts affecting our daily lives. All life on Earth is predominately carbon based and therefore everything we eat and drink has carbon in it. For us to eliminate excess carbon build-up, we do so by exhaling about 100 times the quantity of the CO₂ gas that we inhale. Each adult human exhales roughly 360kgs of CO₂ per year.

The seriously stupid idea of humans and animals being taxed for either CO₂ or methane emissions is a concept that requires the provision of extraordinary evidence of harm. Yet there is none. Moreover, on an annual basis, human generated CO₂ emissions from all sources amounts to about 4% of all emissions, so there are many natural drivers to influence the residual balance remaining within the atmosphere, many of which are ignored by the UN IPCC.

Nitrous oxide (0.3ppm) and methane (1.8ppm) are too rare in the atmosphere and their efficacy at the molecular level is too low for anyone to competently contend they pose any threat to the climate. **That is a red flag for fraud.**

2.

From scientific records – since the beginning of time there has never been a period (however short) when it can be seen that a change in atmospheric CO₂ has ever resulted in a change in the climate. 540 million years ago when the first complex life forms on Earth first emerged, the average global temperature was estimated at 22 ° Celsius and atmospheric CO₂ was estimated at 7,000ppm.

There is good empirical evidence that the level of atmospheric CO₂ is affected by changes in Earth's temperature because the oceans (which today hold 50 times the CO₂ in the atmosphere) discharge it (and all gases) when warming and take it up when cooling. Progressively, most of the atmospheric CO₂ of 540 million years ago has been sequestered in earth, rocks, ocean sediment and fossil remains and is no longer available. The passage of successive glaciations and interglacial intervals of the Pleistocene period have led to a ratcheting down of atmospheric CO₂ to the point where it hit a new low at the end of the last ice age – about 12,000 years ago

- that is estimated to have been only 180ppm. This was only 30ppm above the estimated extinction level, for all life on Earth (150ppm).

The Minister for Climate Change, NIWA and the Ministry for the Environment are either parties to deceptive and misleading conduct, or derelict in their duty of care to the public because they routinely refer enquiries from concerned citizens to sections of the published UN IPCC reports which contain no empirical scientific evidence despite their unwarranted assertions that human carbon emissions affect the climate. When told they don't, those organisations claim that is only because sceptics refuse to accept the truth and they have further and pointedly built a generic allegation that they either don't understand the science, or are simply "climate change deniers".

Publications from the various ministries, universities, the UN IPCC and authors at all levels of expertise in the subject matter who support the idea of a human induced climate emergency, frequently claim that current temperatures are "unprecedented", or that the warming, ice melt, distress for polar bears, forest fires and sea level rise are each "worse than previously predicted," despite there being no evidence of that at all. Daily, the news contains only anomalous warming and never anomalous cooling, despite there being plenty. Anyone can find the truth but by doing so, or publishing that you did so, leads to withdrawal of media access. The Holocene climate optimum actually occurred some 4,000 years ago. The physical evidence of many earlier events is available in written history. Complexity has its place in science but only when backed by observable data.

Because water vapour comprises 96% of all greenhouse gases and has a low dwell time before condensing at higher altitude, the UN IPCC has created a tenuous falsehood that the role of water vapour depends entirely of the level of atmospheric CO₂. That is proven to be grossly misleading, and despite water vapour, clouds and precipitation being the dominant climate moderating forces, the misdirection is deliberate. Water vapour has properties that the other greenhouse gases lack. By analysing the correlation between temperature and humidity from place to place and time to time, it is possible for anyone to recognise the power of water vapour to influence weather – thereby climate within minutes to a level of efficacy greater than that of the entire increase in the concentration of CO₂ since 1850.

The increase in average global temperature by about 1° C over the period since the end of the "Little Ice Age" (1300 to 185AD) is well within natural variability. The Little Ice Age was cold, not normal! The suggestion that it was, is just misdirection. The inability to establish a credible correlation between the continued rise in atmospheric CO₂ and temperature led to the "Climate-gate scandal" and typical of such malfeasance, the coordinated alterations of the temperature records throughout the OECD was an example of the tactics used. While the scientific community closed ranks to excuse that crime against science, there remains no evidence to show why the climate has not always been driven by the variations in solar activity where a more credible continuous causal relationship exists.

Meantime a form of "Omerta" is officially enforced at international and local levels to maintain a veneer of plausible deniability for what is now the biggest ever fraud in history. How do

supposedly “green” politicians promote a campaign against the most useful gas in Earth’s environment and get away with the deception? You tell me!

John Rofe, Auckland
December 2020

9th

4. The Loss of Innocence for NZ Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern’s Team of Five Million – Part I

New Zealand is a land bordered by sea, sand and surf so it is no wonder we have some of the best sailors and surfers to be found anywhere. Surfers know that as soon as the sun rises in the East, the wind gets up and glassy rides cannot then be found until the evening when the sun goes down. Sailors voyaging to the Pacific islands know that the wind strength intensifies towards each afternoon, then it tends to fall in the evening. So it is little wonder that **we automatically accept that the sun supplies 99.9% of Earth’s energy budget.**

Our sailors have all quickly learned the difference between the terms “windward” and “leeward”, and also between “port” and “starboard”. After all, these determine the rules of the road, so that in any seaway the captain of every boat knows which has right of way and which must alter course to avoid a collision.

New Zealand is blessed as a narrow chain of islands which run North to South over a thousand miles or so. We are in a region known as “the Westerly Wind Belt” where the passage of frontal systems traverses our land from a Westerly to an Easterly direction. This allows us to demonstrate what really causes the difference between the climates of New Zealand towns, **it is what is called by scientists, “the water cycle”.**

The water cycle begins with evaporation from the huge reservoir of the oceans, lakes and rivers. These cover about 70% of Earth’s surface. Most climate scientists don’t publicise the fact that water vapour is always present in the driest deserts, or in the frozen Arctic regions. But the warmer the air, the more water vapour it can hold before it rains. So in tropical forests it may comprise about 4% of the atmosphere. In both New Zealand and on average, water vapour forms about 1% of Earth’s total atmosphere – up to the altitude where it would freeze (10-15kms). Water vapour is lighter than air, so it rises until it condenses as clouds. In its alter ego as water, when it becomes heavier than air, it falls to Earth’s surface as rain, hail or snow. So everyone understands that there is **“an ocean of water” suspended in the sky**, so big that we need to quantify its volume and significance. It is huge! **Annual evaporation is roughly 423 trillion tonnes** and precipitation roughly matches that, leaving **15 to 20 trillion tonnes suspended above us**. When rain, hail or snow falls, **it always has a cooling effect**. For this reason precipitation is always a moderating effect on climate. The hotter it is, the greater the evaporation and the greater the condensation and rainfall.

The other main feature of the water cycle is its power to clean up our atmosphere. After an asteroid strike, volcanic eruption, of other catastrophe and even human pollution, the water

cycle has always restored our atmosphere... and as the geologists point out, this has kept Earth's temperature between a maximum average of 22°C and a minimum average of about 10°C for at least the last 540 million years.

Solar electromagnetic radiation enters our outer atmosphere as light, in the entire spectrum from ultra-violet, through what we see as visible light, to infrared. However it is absorbed and/or reflected by Earth's atmosphere, such that only about half of it actually arrives at Earth's surface. At high altitude, atmospheric oxygen converts the dangerous UV rays into ozone. The tiny but opaque droplets of water in clouds reflect a fair proportion of the sun's rays. Then also the proportion of our atmosphere that comprises what are called by climate scientists "greenhouse gases" (because they keep Earth from cooking during the day and from freezing during the night) absorb and reflect the solar heat. There are four of these greenhouse gases – all invisible to the human eye. Water vapour ("H₂O") is greatest in volume and all scientists agree that it comprises 96% of all greenhouse gases. Then there is carbon dioxide ("CO₂") at 0.04% and is therefore just a trace gas. Methane gas ("CH₄") is far less in volume still, and nitrous oxide ("N₂O") is much rarer still. It is the calculation – or rather estimation - of how much CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O we humans emit which is the subject of efforts by the UN and some governments, including our own, to justify levying a tax on our emissions and

2.

thereby to save the climate from heating up...or so they claim. The atmospheric cooling from 1945 to 1975 which certainly did occur, should have dispelled any notion that human emissions cause global warming.

The group of climate scientists who believe humans are changing the climate ("the humanists") promote the idea that we must reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide. But they have a problem. There is no empirical scientific evidence that elevated levels of these gases affect the climate. Nor can they advance any, other than pointing out the three gases whose emissions we affect (CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O) do have a tiny radiative effect. The problem with that is that recent and conclusive atomic absorption spectroscopic research has proven that the radiative effect of water vapour totally dominates the effect of those other gases, and that is without taking into account its alter egos which are surface ice, snow, clouds and precipitation. **From atomic absorption spectroscopy (which actually is good empirical scientific evidence) water vapour molecules have five times the radiative efficacy of CO₂ for incoming solar radiation, and twelve times the molecular efficacy for outgoing radiated heat as infrared radiation. The efficacy of CH₄ and N₂O molecules is so low that for climate warming purposes they are totally irrelevant.** Water vapour always varies in density, sometimes rapidly from place to place. In the process and as already proven by empirical scientific evidence, it moderates any variations from normal impacts on climate, from whatever cause - natural or human.

For CO₂, the large group of "rationalist" scientists who are pejoratively labelled as "Climate change deniers" point out a further problem. It has been found by experimentation that the rules of the Beer-Lambert law of physics apply. This means that **the thermal radiative impact**

of CO₂ was substantially saturated at the pre-industrial level (approx. 280ppm) and any further increases, or even reductions of say 20% of today's atmospheric level of CO₂, cannot possibly have any material effect on our climate. CO₂ clearly does have a minor role, but that is *demonstrably minor*. The UN IPCC scientists claim without any empirical scientific evidence whatsoever that while natural forces acting through water vapour have influenced Earth's climate in the past, the addition of human greenhouse gas emissions now dominates. Confronting and giving the lie to this, expert evidence from the University of Auckland's Emeritus Professor of Chemical Engineering Geoffrey Duffy FRSNZ, shows why the natural water cycle modifies even the major catastrophic heating or cooling events that Earth encounters. For the water cycle, human "carbon emissions" are child's play.

I am not a climate scientist. I am just a 73yr old retired forensic investigator with plenty of fraud investigation experience. I started trying to work out which version of climate change is correct and which is just hooey. I found to my surprise that I could easily prove which is correct and which is wrong. My eventual conclusion is that the claim of **Global Warming is just a fraud**. So I have documented it and referred it to the proper authorities, the NZ Police, the NZ Serious Fraud Office and the Secretary for Justice.

For water vapour to be the overwhelmingly dominant greenhouse gas, it must be evident in the climate from time to time and place to place. **In New Zealand with one windward coast and one leeward coast we have the ideal laboratory.** The clouds climb up the mountains and release their rain, thereafter the air is drier. By selecting pairs of New Zealand towns with the same latitude and at the same altitude and taking maximum and minimum temperature for each, I was able to compare temperatures with applicable humidity, after converting relative to actual humidity (in grams of water per kilogram of air) as supplied by NIWA. This demonstrates that the town with the most greenhouse gas (i.e. water vapour) mostly had the lowest daily maximum temperature and the lowest amount of heat loss, yielding the lowest diurnal temperature range. Far from nuanced, the differences turned out to be very large! This result was proven on 11/12 and 21/22 February 2020, then replicated on 22/23 September 2020. A dozen towns were chosen for those dates.

3.

These below are indicative of the results of the East coast to West Coast comparisons...but the situation even applies from North to South and others at various altitudes...

The average figures (but over only those three days) are:

Location	Av. Daily max. In °C	Av. Diurnal range in °C.	Av	Daily
humidity in gms/kg				
Christchurch	23.7°C	10.7°C		7.1gms
Greymouth	17.7°C	4.3°C		9.5gms
Napier	23.3°C	7.7°C		8.0gms

New Plymouth
10.0gms

20.0°C

5.0°C

You will notice two features. 1. The solar gain and therefore the maximum temperature in the towns with lowest humidity was far higher, and 2. The heat loss was far greater due to escaping heat at night, to yield a far higher diurnal temperature range than for the towns with a higher proportion of the dominant greenhouse gas (water vapour). This difference is not always as pronounced, but it dominates anyway.

We see this in comparative TV temperatures nightly. I also compared average annual rainfall with the average diurnal temperature range for each town for the four months August to November 2019 inclusive.

For the first pair...Christchurch had a rainfall of 648mm compared to an average diurnal range of 11.25°C. Greymouth had rainfall of 2553mm compared with an average diurnal temperature range of 7.5°C.

And for the second pair... Napier had a rainfall of 879mm compared with an average diurnal range of 10°C. New Plymouth had a rainfall of 1,609mm compared with an average diurnal temperature range of 6.75°C.

Our total “greenhouse” effect is really water vapour, clouds, ice, snow and rainfall – the complete water cycle. This proof is not rocket science because it has always been known that low humidity in deserts leads to extreme heat during the day and yet extreme cold during the night. My figures can be checked by any year 12/13 school child. **The figures on the internet come from NIWA, so I have asked them to explain this.**

Any farmer or horticulturalist who ever looked outside at 10pm on cold nights to see whether there were any clouds and mist obscuring the stars (trying to establish whether there is a risk of a potentially damaging frost), will know instinctively that the force of the water cycle is huge. Don't forget that clouds cover 60-70% of the Earth's surface at any instant. So government is lying to farmers about carbon dioxide and methane emissions! But I don't need this data to know that the folk at NIWA, the University of Auckland, Victoria University of Wellington and others have never done any proper due diligence. **They have all merely accepted and endorsed the fraud that originated at the United Nations using the blatantly convenient lie that Anthropogenic Global Warming is “settled science”, when in fact there is no proper science backing it at all. The output of mathematical computer models based on assumptions isn't science – it is just maths.**

Anthropogenic Global Warming has required an ever increasing sophistry to obscure the truth. It is big, long-lasting frauds like this, with their intricate sophistry that do the most damage to the fabric of society. This lie is obvious every day, whenever we witness the huge influence of the sun and the water cycle.

John Rofe, Private Investigator
10 October 2020

Auckland, NZ,

6. The Most Probable Cause of Climate Change during the Holocene Interglacial Period

The Holocene interglacial period began at the end of the most recent full ice age which ended about 11,700 years ago. It is generally accepted that the passage of Ice Ages and their interglacial intervals occurs every 100,000-120,000 years and they are caused by what are termed as *Milankovich Cycles*, from the alterations to the tilt and obliquity of Earth's posture toward the sun and the more dramatic eccentric orbit cycle that increases Earth's distance from the sun for tens of thousands of years. Major individual volcanic events also play a part in dramatically altering the Earth's weather for a few years until the water cycle cleans up.

The sun rules our lives in predictable fashion, not just daily, but also throughout the year with the change of seasons. Diurnal temperature changes are very large as are seasonal changes. We can set our clocks by the impact the sun has on our lives. It provides almost all Earth's energy, so logically small variations in solar activity should have a profound impact. For some reason this has impressed our forebears and yet the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change ("UN IPCC") have managed to ascribe a dominant role for humanity in changing our climate from their vague idea of what constitutes normality, to a notional "Hot-house Hell". The second article of the UN IPCC charter on establishment in 1988 gave them the motivation to do this without the need for them to be otherwise accountable for their actions.

From ancient times, whether from biblical records or the records of the historians of early civilisations, the role of the sun in providing good and bad harvests was well known. For the Egyptians, who even worshipped Amun Ra (the god of the sun and air), the passage of seven years of plenty followed by years of famine was the subject of official planning. In 1801 the English astronomer William Herschel was the first to note a correlation between a level of solar activity and climate after his discovery of an inverse relationship between the wheat price and the cyclic variations in solar activity. During years of high solar activity the wheat price dropped because there were typically good harvests and wheat was plentiful. The opposite occurred during years of low solar activity. In many isolated rural communities, farmers and fisher-folk still confidently plan their activities on the solar and lunar cycles, without any understanding of the detailed science or access to broadcast weather forecasts. The place where the agricultural effect of the 11-year solar minimum is most marked is Russia. In 2008/9 they had drought conditions and it is the same this year. The outer layer of Earth's atmosphere at the thermal interface with space – the Troposphere - warms during solar maximums and then cools during a solar minimum to one tenth the heat. When it cools it shrinks, thereby reducing the radius of Earth's atmosphere, solely due to the solar cycles as far more heat is lost.

Solar maximums occur when the sun's poles swap places, approximately every 11 years and every solar cycle is different in its level of electromagnetic activity. Every so often a group of relatively inactive solar cycles occurs. Each group of inactive cycles is called a Grand Solar Minimum. There is a mathematical synchronicity to these cycles which have been the subject of intensifying research since mankind first aspired to venture into outer space. Yet not all of the sun's activities can be forecast...CMEs for example.

In 1976 the late John A. Eddy, a US astronomer identified a close correlation between the solar cycles and climate in both phase and amplitude since 1600AD. He did this by closely analysing all of the Grand Solar Minimums of the last thousand years. In 1988 the Russian geophysicist Dr E. Borisenkov reported on his studies over 7,500 years of history during which he noted how, during 18 separate quasi-bicentennial cycles, warming was associated with periods of high solar activity and cooling was associated with low solar activity.

2.

The UN IPCC ignored the work of Borisenkov when, from the “get-go” it began its first raft of exaggerated warnings about the potentially disastrous effects of human “carbon emissions” causing Anthropogenic Global Warming, for which absolutely no scientific evidence existed or is possible (as is still the case today!). The other good reason to accept the Russian position is because their climate modelling is accurate.

Just as Earth’s moon provides a gravitational pull on the tides, the sun’s changed electromagnetic effect also changes its gravitational relationship with Earth and other planets (together with their moons) within the solar system. Changes to the solar/Earth magnetosphere perturb the Earth’s tectonic plates.

While the UN IPCC-allied scientists (together with their expensive computer climate models) down-played the solar cycles’ impacts, many non-aligned scientists from NASA (retirees) and elsewhere continued to shadow and support the work of the Russians. These include Professor Valentina Zharkova (and her team) based at Northumbria University (UK) and John L. Casey (formerly of NASA), the author of three influential books, “Dark Winter”, “Cold Sun” and “Upheaval”. A notable physicist called Dr Harrison Schmitt, who at age 85yrs is still today an active scientist working on the design of fuels for use in nuclear fusion. Some years ago, he led a 40 scientist/astronaut’s revolt against NASA’s unwarranted and shady reorganisation of records to support the UN IPCC climate theories. From my observations the group of sceptics is growing stronger as scientists defect from the UN IPCC position. Yet the fraud grows ever larger.

The various researcher members of the Russian Academy of Sciences’ conclude that every time that Total Solar Insolation (“TSI”) reached its quasi-bicentennial peak, ample evidence existed that a period of global warming began, but with a time delay of 20 years, plus or minus 8 years, defined by the thermal inertia of the ocean. They concluded that each quasi bicentennial reduction in TSI in turn gave rise to a “Little Ice Age”. This is also supported by NASA’s own data and yet it is differently emphasised.

During the period which is called the “Little Ice Age” by Western scientists, which ran from about 1280 to 1850AD there were a number of warm periods and a variety of Grand Solar Minimums, so the Russian scientists regard them as not one but four separate minimums, each with separately identifiable ice ages. This delineates the “Wolf Minimum” (from 1280 to 1350), the “Spörer Minimum” (from 1450 to 1550), the “Maunder Minimum” (from 1645 to 1715) and the “Dalton Minimum” (from 1790 to 1820) as separate cold periods. These were sometimes accompanied with one or more years without a summer due to volcanism.

The space age led to NASA launching a network of satellites to monitor temperature in 1979. Since that time regular and consistent monitoring of the average global temperature for the atmosphere (the “Lower Troposphere” which is where we live) has been recorded by two agencies with the contract to do so, and the result is published within a few days of month end. As of the end of September 2020 the global average temperature showed, for the 41 years since 1979, **an increase (on average) of 0.14°C. per decade, or 1.4°C. per century if the atmosphere continues to warm at the current rate.** The Russian scientists observe (as supported by many others) that there is a close correlation between the record of temperatures from all sources and the levels of activity of recent solar cycles numbered 17 to 24 inclusive, so they now expect a period of profound cooling during the period to the year 2100..

In the light of the satellite records of global warming at 0.14°C per decade and a drop in temperature for 30 years before that, recent UN IPCC-centric warnings of an ongoing decadal warming of 0.4°C and higher for the next 100 years are not credible. They are just sophistry built upon sophistry without any basis in reality.

3.

The solar cycles of the 20th century included three of the most active solar cycles in the last 4,000 years which likely accounts for the warming to date of the “Modern Warm Period”. It certainly is a better fit than ascribing causation to increased atmospheric CO₂, because that correlation was destroyed during the 30 year period from 1945 to 1975 when CO₂ rose and temperature dropped. It also explains the temperature pause from 1999 to 2015 (inclusive) when the rate of human “carbon emissions” accelerated.

The role of the sun in determining the weather experienced by the entire solar system and the role of that weather in establishing either a warming or cooling trend for Earth is well known, so a public web site provides regular daily updates of data from the official statistics. (www.spaceweather.com)

A Grand Solar Minimum is now beginning, although there is still disagreement of how cold it will get. The last graph of the presentation by Russia’s Dr Habibullo Abdussamatov (at 15 minutes 26 seconds) at the link below, shows how they rated the end of solar cycle 24 with the likely progress of solar cycles 25 & 26. With the benefit of hindsight, his forecast published of 6 years ago is demonstrably on point.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gdNw8-Cq8h8&feature=emb_logo

Slide after slide on Dr Habibullo’s above presentation supports what many independent Western scientists regard as the Russian superiority in their analysis of the solar influence. The Russian superiority is founded on their unbiased views about the relationship between temperature and atmospheric levels of CO₂. UN IPCC researchers still persist in the re-interpretation of the results of the Vostok ice core analysis which had demonstrated that over history (geological, ancient and modern) the changes to atmospheric CO₂ trailed changes in temperature rather than led them. **On the basis of acknowledged drop in global surface temperature from 1945 to 1975 and from Dr Habibullo’s graph at 3 minutes and 2**

seconds on the above linked video, assertions by the UN IPCC that human carbon emissions cause climate change are disproven.

The major space agencies still have a focus on the sun. So probes and other activities will clarify areas where the science is still immature and confidence in the detail is not yet universal. Meantime the data published includes the statistics on sun spots, because the more numerous and active the sun spots, the greater the strength and density of the solar wind. The inverse of the strength of the solar wind, is the rate of the influx of galactic cosmic rays (these come from far off galactic star explosions). The solar wind excludes many cosmic rays from the solar system. There are ongoing studies of how the cosmic rays affect cloud nucleation and magma stimulation. As we are moving from a solar minimum between cycles 24 and 25 to the lesser activity of cycle 25 (as it increases) the currently high level of cosmic rays reduces the safe time astronauts can remain in space. Note all planets in the solar system are affected by the variation in the solar activity.

The changed magnetosphere perturbs the Earth's tectonic plates and studies have shown a correlation between volcanism and Grand Solar Minimums. So it shouldn't be any surprise that volcanism has again risen sharply since 2018 (when fatalities that year amounted to about the same as the total for the previous 18 years). In 2019 a major volcanic eruption occurred in the Pacific Ocean and yet it only rated mention because it left a large lake of pumice floating on the surface. Four times as many volcanoes are under the sea as on land. This is an area where their contribution to the heating of the ocean and West Antarctic glaciers is glossed over. Russia and China are now well into preparations for a major cooling event based on their view of solar cycles. They accept the next Grand Solar Minimum has started and know the likely consequences.

**John Rofe, Private Investigator, Auckland, New Zealand 10
October 2020**

6.The Loss of Innocence for Jacinda Ardern's Team of Five Million – Part III

The Climate fraud may be busted, yet there may be no Justice or Punishment for the Perpetrators

Why do so many people deliberately lie to the general public, and how do they get away with it?

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ftmkgsrfDNs&feature=youtu.be>

Anthropogenic Global Warming (aka "Climate Change") is not just the biggest fraud in history but the most decentralised. At its core is a group, alternatively called "The New World Order" or the "Davos brigade" and these folk consist of the heads of global corporations, the richest people on earth and powerful (often of a socialist persuasion) politicians, toady scientists and the drivers of the pseudo-green movement. Now the globalist billionaires have – for reasons, other than the profits to be made - taken financial control of the mainstream media, there are no restraints on officially sanctioned lies. So much for the "free press"!

This is analogous to the 17th Century problem that Galileo Galilei struck. The courts have been corrupted by biased testimony and even judges aren't immune. Even our children are being taught that right is wrong.

There are two major climate factors at play during the Holocene interglacial period. The first is the role of the solar cycles that can easily be seen in the impacts it has had over the centuries that have been extensively documented.

The second is the role of the water cycle which has been subjected to a range of lies and misdirection.

A simple example of misdirection appeared when Professor Myles Allen of Oxford University, who would likely flatter himself that he is a "humanist" (i.e. supporting the notion that humans can alter the climate), he coached a San Francisco judge during the trial of the oil companies for the supposed damage caused by carbon emissions. In his series of video tutorials he casually points out that carbon dioxide ("CO₂") causes global warming, even though it provides less than half of one percent of the atmosphere. So the presentation is all about CO₂. There are two problems with Prof. Allen's statement. First, there is no empirical scientific evidence that CO₂ causes climate change (despite trillions of dollars having been spent over the last 40 years to try to find evidence). Second, he is materially astray in his estimation of the volume of CO₂ in the atmosphere. It actually comprises 415ppm at the time of writing, or 0.0415% of the atmosphere. **The trace CO₂ gas that he represents as "less than half of one percent" is just a tiny, one twenty-fifth of one percent.** He even told the Judge it causes 80% of warming.

In a later chapter of this same video series, he alludes as a vague generality to the "well-known problems for the climate" from emissions of methane ("CH₄") and nitrous oxide ("N₂O"). I can't say he is inaccurate as to volume, because he doesn't even bother to tell us that CH₄ is only about 1.8 parts per million or 230 times less in atmospheric concentration than CO₂. Of course N₂O is many times rarer than CH₄. But what he also fails to tell us is that all of these gases are dominated in the atmosphere by water vapour (H₂O) and while each "blameworthy gas" (in other words the CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O) does have radiative effects, the efficacy of each is orders of magnitude less than the efficacy of water vapour.

But water vapour also has 28 non-radiative thermal properties as well. Although each part of the water cycle plays a major role in the climate, the combined effect doesn't rate much mention from the UN IPCC-centric scientists. All three "blame-worthy" gases together have no identifiable impact on either our daily or weekly weather; and their atmospheric concentrations increase by such a small percentage each year that they don't change much from time to time, or from place to place.

The academics fall into one of two categories. Those who go along with the UN IPCC doctrine (that I believe to be a fraud) and who therefore get employed by government agencies and universities, and those who disagree and are marginalised or deliberately prevented from receiving access to printing their works...and often simply sacked. Courts of law are obliged to select expert witnesses from what has become orthodoxy,

2.

whether it is right or wrong. Professor Allen, tried to influence the judge and us, due to what may at best be described as his unconscious bias, or else as the worst of all scientific crimes, "Pay for Play". Whether he has studied the solar sciences or not is unclear, but every supporter of the climate fraud has either through ignorance or design, supported Anthropogenic Global

Warming without empirical scientific evidence despite clear and better evidence that the sun rules our planet's existence and far more likely drives our climate.

But unconsciously, even Wikipedia supports the Great Global Warming fraud. Water vapour gets no mention as a major constituent part of the atmosphere, because Wikipedia only provides estimates of the proportionate contents of dry air, thereby failing to point out that **always and everywhere, water vapour exists in greater or lesser quantities in Earth's atmosphere.** Yet behind nitrogen and oxygen it is probably 3rd densest, at about 1%. If not, it is just behind or level pegging with argon, which is approximately 0.9%.

Even Photosynthesis is not safe when negligent or improper misdirection is used by eminent scientists.

Plant photosynthesis involves taking in CO₂ through pores in leaves and water from the plants' roots. Then by adding light, the process of photosynthesis provides the plant sugars that enable plants to grow, flourish, bear fruit and procreate. The equation taught to me (and seemingly to Judith Collins too) at school was:



It seems that for modern teachers of a "progressive socialist" persuasion, both the role of water and the role of CO₂ can be either magnified or downplayed to suit their narrative. Each simplistic narrative on climate change that is published either changes or de-emphasises the truth about light, carbon, water, carbon dioxide or oxygen to suit their purpose.

This is important because CO₂ is not a pollutant, yet we are told it is. The only reason for bracketing CH₄ and N₂O with CO₂ is to justify UN member governments' waste of time and resources supporting their fraud. Otherwise sooner or later, people will wake up to the truth that more CO₂ in the atmosphere is good and less is bad for our natural environment. So why then do they promote their deliberate and cynical agenda?

The three things which are absolutely essential for all complex life on Earth to exist are:

-water

-oxygen

-carbon dioxide

No other planet has yet been found which possesses these three essentials for life, yet we have grown so complacent and so greedy that we can delude ourselves that we are all modern-day "King Canutes". Not only do we claim we can hold back the tides (which we do with dykes and land reclamations), but we will supposedly flood cities simply by exhaling CO₂ and running automobiles. In anyone's book, that is nonsense.

540 million years ago, CO₂ was apparently about 7,000ppm and the first plants to grow became gigantic, so along with that was gigantism for the dinosaurs, birds and fish until 66 million years ago when an asteroid strike ushered in large scale extinctions. With each successive ice age after that, the atmospheric quantity of CO₂ was reduced and with the demise of every successive fossil generation it was progressively removed from the air and seas and sequestered in rocks and ocean sediment. **Its scarcity threatens the carbon cycle.**

Today, and while the oceans contain 50 times the atmospheric level of CO₂, they are warm and so they are still out-gassing. Yet before the beginning of the Quaternary Ice Age 34 million

years ago, the level of atmospheric CO₂ had fallen to below 600ppm when Antarctica froze over and ever since that time had been at ever lower levels until it reached an all-time low of 180ppm at the end of the last Ice Age 12,000 yrs ago.

3.

During the preceding warm period to that of the Holocene, 120,000 years ago (called the “Eemian”) the temperature was much warmer than today and yet the maximum atmospheric concentration of CO₂ at that time was less than the level of 280ppm it was during our own pre-industrial times in 1850AD.

Plant life requires 150ppm of CO₂ for survival and the most desirable level has been assessed as 1,200ppm. Yet without the use of otherwise sequestered carbon in fossil fuels and consequent “carbon emissions”, all life on Earth may face extinction during the next 90,000 year Ice Age that our descendents encounter.

To ensure that extra atmospheric CO₂ is not considered a net good, the UN IPCC has sponsored many studies to promote the downside of ice loss (when there are none), the fate of polar bear extinction (while their numbers have always survived far hotter times than the present, and recent studies show their numbers are more than ever previously recorded), rapid sea level rise (when it has only been 1.3 to 1.8mm per year and will reverse as soon as cooling next begins), ocean acidification (when every school child should know the ocean has a pH of 8.2 to 8.3 and is irrevocably saline and alkaline). Wide ranging studies have been commissioned to show how bad global warming during the Modern Warm Period is. The problem is that humanity only ever advanced and prospered during the cyclic warm periods and was always set back during cold spells. To suit the criminal aspirations of certain parties attempting to wrest control at the UN, **we are lied to, that cold is good and warm is bad.** So the UN IPCC fraud is cloaked in fakery and scientific sophistry.

The climate fraud is now institutionalised and supported by most OECD scientists in all institutions reliant on Government funding. Even our National airline supports the fraud with carbon trading schemes.

Months ago I hoped three questions could be resolved by a declaratory judgement from the NZ High Court.

1. Do human “carbon emissions” cause climate change? (*hint: I can prove they don't!*)
2. Is CO₂ a pollutant or a gas essential for all life on Earth? (*hint: this is a no-brainer!*)
3. Is it possible to alter the climate by reducing NZ's “carbon emissions”? (*hint: refer 1. above*)

I approached a major Auckland legal firm and secured the names of the four most appropriate barristers to represent me. One claimed pressure of work because it was outside his firm's scope of practice. The other three claimed to have existing clients who would require and remunerate the barrister in question to represent them, rather than for that person to represent me in this matter. **So much for the justice system!**

How then does our society protect our children, if no-one will fight for the truth?

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lsjj1hk0BL4&feature=youtu.be>

and

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BiDKWU1ySQw&feature=youtu.be>

Why do we have pseudo-environmentalists governing us? They threaten our prosperity and very survival? For the last 540 million years every complex life form on Earth has been carbon-based. Every animal and human exhales 100 times the carbon dioxide we inhale and plants return us the favour of inhaling our CO₂ and exhaling oxygen. Because I exhale 360kgs of CO₂ per year, how much carbon tax must I pay to exist?

What is there about the facts that James Shaw and Jacinda Ardern find so hard to accept? I buy that they promote a covert socialist ideology, **but I don't buy them selling out NZ taxpayers to foreign interests.**

**John Rofe Private Investigator
October 2020**

Auckland, New Zealand

10

18 Graven Court

Western Heights

Henderson 0612

Auckland

2 August 2020

**7. FORMAL COMPLAINT TO THE OFFICER COMMANDING, NZ POLICE –
HENDERSON AREA**

TIME IS OF THE ESSENCE

By Hand

Dear Superintendant,

Following many years of investigation and supported by both empirical scientific evidence and having diligently and independently pursued the empirical observations to back up my allegations, I wish to register three complaints of fraud. They are as follows:

FORMAL COMPLAINT REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF SERIOUS FRAUD BY THE CHIEF SCIENTIST, CLIMATE AND ATMOSPHERE, OF NIWA.

FORMAL COMPLAINT REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF SERIOUS FRAUD BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF NEW ZEALAND, THE RT. HONOURABLE JACINDA ARDERN.

FORMAL COMPLAINT REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF SERIOUS FRAUD BY THE MINISTER FOR CLIMATE CHANGE, THE HONOURABLE JAMES SHAW.

I allege they are promoting for personal gain, the quasi-scientific theory of Anthropogenic Global Warming, with no empirical scientific evidential support for the de-bunked theory they promote.

Internationally, this has become the biggest fraud in world history and it involves three main limbs:

1. Falsely representing that human emissions of carbon dioxide gas, methane and nitrous oxide are key drivers of climate change, partially by minimising the role of the solar influence, clouds and water vapour. No empirical scientific evidence exists to support their claims.
2. Falsely representing that carbon dioxide gas is a pollutant, when it is a gas essential for all life on earth.
3. Falsely representing that the New Zealand Government is capable of changing the climate by altering the New Zealand emissions of the three gases mentioned in point 1. above.

Herewith is a copy of my email of 4 July 2018 and a letter received in late 2018 containing the Government's misguided and disproven claims. Also a copy of my warning to Minister James Shaw that is dated 15 May 2019 that outlines the basis of the above allegations of fraud.

My research has been transparently provided to a wide range of politicians from all parties. The allegations have been pursued at regular intervals over the last three years. The Government has relied on a news blackout in the matter and as a result, while they acknowledge receipt of my emails

2.

they haven't made any other response. I have tried to minimise the impact of my allegations on the people involved and failed to achieve any traction. This is a blatant abuse of their statutory powers.

I am an active conservationist and the actions of Government, while damaging to the New Zealand economy bring disrepute to both the scientific community and the conservation movement.

My personal resources have been sufficient to **now prove beyond reasonable doubt that an ongoing, systemic and costly fraud has occurred and is planned for the future.** I have been able to independently validate the evidence provided by the international and domestic scientific experts.

My personal resources are not sufficient to prove the parties intended to commit the fraud. Only you have those resources and are entrusted with the job of protecting the New Zealand public.

There is a massive amount of information available to support this allegation and yet absolutely no empirical scientific evidence to refute my claims. Herewith are the following documents:

1. Scope of facts, headed “A TALE OF FRAUD, COMPLICITY AND ARRANT STUPIDITY”
2. A summary of the evidence against the core fraud, headed “GOOD NEWS- NO CRISIS – AND CARBON DIOXIDE DOESN’T EVEN CAUSE CLIMATE CHANGE”.
3. A note on how physical evidence supports the expert empirical scientific evidence provided by the scientists, headed “ARRANT STUPIDITY – or – RESTATING THE OBVIOUS”.
4. A short paper describing the business, political and media influences ensuring the truth never leaks into the mainstream media, headed “Many Whistleblowers – Yet nothing to be heard”.

This matter is the most serious set of allegations ever provided to a New Zealand Police station because the implications of derivative frauds includes all schemes for Carbon Tax, The Zero Carbon Act, all carbon trading and schemes for selling carbon credits are all frauds and many of the actions of Government departments focused on “Climate Change” are all parts of the core fraud.

Please therefore provide this letter and attachments to the Commissioner of Police, for discussion with the Secretary for Justice. The Secretary has been separately appraised.

I believe that neither Minister James Shaw nor PM Jacinda Ardern is a fit and proper person to be elected as part of the next Government. I stand ready to cooperate with your investigations.

Yours faithfully

John Rofe

Experienced Private Fraud Investigator